

REMARKS

Claims 7, 10, 14, 15, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16-18, amended claims 1 and 13, and new claim 20 are in this application.

Claims 8 and 9 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In explaining this objection, the Examiner stated that claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 which has been canceled.

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended herein so as to change the dependency from claim 7 to claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the above objection of claims 8 and 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 11-13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,503 (Margulis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,503 (Naka et al.), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0202006 (Callway), U.S. Patent No. 5,557,338 (Maze et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,460,181 (Donnelly).

Each of independent claims 1 and 13 (from which claims 2-5, 11, 12, and 16 depend) has been amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"wherein the secondary display is operable to display at least one index image of contents, and contents obtained from television broadcast and the Internet can be selected for display,"
(Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1 (and claim 13). With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to line 7 of page 23 to line 4 of page 24 and Fig. 7 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above-identified features now recited in claim 1. That is, the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly does not appear to disclose "the secondary display is operable to display at least one index image of contents . . ." as in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) More specifically, in explaining the above 103 rejection, the Examiner appears to assert that Donnelly (and in particular line 57 of column 10 to line 42 of column 11 and Figs. 2-4 thereof) discloses a secondary display "operable to display" (See lines 10-13 of page 6 of the present Office Action.) Such portions of Donnelly do not appear to disclose that a "secondary display is operable to display at least one index image of contents . . ." as in claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 13 is also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly.

Claims 2-5, 11, 12, and 16 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-5, 11, 12, and 16

are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway, Maze et al., and Donnelly as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836 (Huang et al.).

Claim 8 is dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claim 8 is also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Huang to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Donnelly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze, Donnelly and Huang.

Claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway, Maze et al., and Donnelly as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0187885 (Miyazaki et al.).

Claims 6 and 9 are dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 6 and 9 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Miyazaki to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Donnelly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 9 are distinguishable from the

applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze, Donnelly and Miyazaki.

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway, Maze et al., and Donnelly as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,622 (Lan et al.).

Claims 17 and 18 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 17 and 18 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Donnelly for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Lan to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Donnelly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 18 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze, Donnelly and Lan.

New independent claim 20 has been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that such new claim is distinguishable over the applied references for reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1.

As it is believed that all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant(s)